American Sociological Association
Community & Urban Sociology Section

Volume 33 Number 1

Winter 2020

CUSS Newsletter

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

2019 Lynd Award Recipient

My Mission as a Social Researcher: How I Remember It

Anne B. Shlay

Anne Shlay, 2019 Lynd Award Recipient.

At 20, I fell in love with the Russians, namely Russian literature. The passion of Bolshevik poets whose public readings of their work drew the masses excited me. I cherished the Russian literary thaw that produced the novels of post Stalinist writers and was heart-broken when they were silenced after the fall of Khrushchev. I studied the Russian language in the hope that I could read Dr. Zhivago in the original. Yet the inspiration of what became my life's work came from Dostoyevsky, a writer from the 19th century.

I learned Dostoyevsky in a standing room only class taught by the great scholar Edward Wasiolek. He was flown in once a week from the University of Chicago to teach a class on Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy at my school, Indiana University/Bloomington. A graduate class filled with students along with every IU Slavic faculty member, I was the 20-year-old sophomore who got in with special permission. I sat on the floor with others and took the class pass/fail.

I attached myself to Dostoyevsky whose depth of understanding the motivations of human behavior, particularly insincere behavior captured

Lynd Award, p. 8

Chair's Message

Japonica Brown-Saracino, Boston University

I want to open my first Chair's Message by thanking our terrific communications team for putting together our newsletter; the behind-the-scenes work that this requires is evident in, among other things, their interviews with several 2019 section award winners. This edition is the first of a new approach to our section communication strategy. Bill Holt is easing out of his longstanding role as our newsletter editor, having provided a great service for approximately

Chair, p. 2

Chair's Message *from page 1*

twenty years. Given this, and that Albert Fu has put together a wonderful section website, the council has adopted a new communication strat egy.

As this edition models, we will now publish a shorter PDF newsletter primarily featuring essays, interviews, and links to material that can be found on our website such as calls for papers, jobs, and notice of conference panels. Going forward, we will publish the newsletter twice annually (in the Fall and Spring) rather than three times per year.

Beyond these changes to the newsletter, as part of the new communication plan, our section chair will publish a monthly email digest that lists section updates, jobs, calls for papers, and conferences. This will reduce the number of emails members receive from the section each month. Please send relevant items to me (japonica@bu.edu) for inclusion in the monthly digest. Finally, we have moved listings of jobs, calls for papers, and conference panels to our website, with links to web material supplied in the newsletter.

We continue to seek additional volunteers to join our Communications Committee, which is responsible for our newsletter and section website. If you are interested in joining the team, please do not hesitate to email me or to reach out to current committee members. The committee's work is vital for our section, as it provides opportunities to highlight and promote the terrific scholarship our members produce, and to provide avenues for developing and deepening our networks.

The scholarship of many section members was on display in August in New York at the ASA Conference. For many of us, our time in New York began at the Community and Urban Sociology Mini-Conference, spearheaded by past-Chair, Rachel Dwyer, and co-sponsored by the NYU Wagner Center for Public Policy, City & Community, and several different units at NYU and Ohio State. The preconference, organized around the theme of Inequality and Social Justice in 21st Century Cities, included a diverse array of panels on topics from urban social movements to racial and ethnic inequality, gentrification, markets, housing, crime, and policy. Happily, registration reached capacity, and panels, as well as lunch and a reception, included a wide range of urbanists who research a variety of urban themes – from graduate students to senior scholars.

Many thanks to Rachel Dwyer and the rest of the conference planning team for a terrific event, which provided an invaluable opportunity for members to gain and give feedback on work in progress, to chart new directions in our subfield, and to forge new connections on panels, as well as over lunch and at the closing reception. Given the success of the mini-conference, the section council has discussed the possibility of future mini-conferences.

Looking ahead to next August, you can find calls for paper submissions for Community and Urban Sociology sessions on the ASA website: https://www.asanet.org/annual-meeting-2020/call-submissionsvolunteers . Thanks to our conference planning team, composed of Jean Beaman, Maggie Kusenbach, and Jessica Simes, we can look forward to panels on Cities and Big Data; Work, Community and the City; Theorizing Renters and Rental Housing in the United States; and New Forms of Precarious Urban Labor. In addition, we encourage submissions to the Community and Urban Sociology Section Roundtables. I look forward to seeing everyone in San Francisco in August.

Finally, and also with an eye to 2020, nomination instructions for section awards have been posted on the ASA website at: https://www.asanet.org/asa-communities/sections/sites/community-and-urban-sociology/2020-call-awards. I encourage everyone to send in their nominations – whether of their own or others' work – for our best book, career achievement, best article, and graduate student paper awards. I offer my gratitude to the many section members who volunteered to serve on the award committees, and look forward to honoring the work of our members in San Francisco.

In closing, I extend congratulations to each of our 2019 Community and Urban Sociology Section award winners, and thank our communications committee members for including interviews with several winners in this edition of our newsletter, as well as Anne Shlay, the winner of our Robert and Helen Lynd Award for Distinguished Career Achievement, for writing our feature essay.

Molotch receives ASA DuBois Award

Harvey Molotch, Professor Emeritus, NYU and UCSB, reflects on his receiving the 2019 ASA W.E.B. DuBois Career of Distinguished Scholarship Award. In a interview with Steven Schmidt,

What initially brought you to urban sociology?

I've always had a thing for land and buildings. Children play with blocks; I kept at it. When growing up in Baltimore I liked watching things go up, including houses and especially movie theaters. From family scuttlebutt I learned that a part of making things happen was connections – that's what gets zoning, building permits, and even permission to have a neon sign. Don't be shocked, dear reader, but there were bribes. When I got to urban social science, my Baltimore was not in it. Crime was certainly there but largely sequestered as criminology. Urban science was about concentric circles, demography, and exotic street corner life. I yearned for the developers, the fixers, and the crooks – and their linkages with the more ordinary folks trying to make their way through the thicket. A lot of my life has been to follow up on that.

What has been the most exciting moment of your career?

I was giving a paper at the ASA, circa 1970, in a session called "Radical Sociology." We were plenty hyped up. It was a full-house in the "Imperial Ballroom" of the Hilton. My paper was called "Oil in Santa Barbara and Power in America" and my big line, which the journal was to edit out: "When the oil hit the water, the shit hit the fan." It went over big, including with the august Talcott Parsons, rollicking in his seat at my insolence. I doubt he could foresee the demise of his structural functionalism and the rise of the intellectual left that was blowing in the (air conditioned) wind. I got it.

I always taught Sociology One, exciting again and again. It was great to teach our greatest hits, which also included, in my version, wonderful stuff from anthropology, history, political science and even economics. I was a heavy user of slides, video, and music; I loved being there as the students saw the light.

What do you think are the most pressing issues for urban scholars to study today?

Changes in land use, whether through growth or contraction, have specific impacts on wealth distribution, social lives, and the natural environment. We need to understand and publicize these effects – this is a special role for urban studies as opposed to sociology more generally.

I don't think we fully resolved the problem of the "urban object" – what is distinctive to the urban as opposed to the social and economic more generally. Too often, in my view, urban sociology means whatever goes on in cities. But since cities are the commonplace of life, this delimits very little. The urban matters, not by declaration but by clear display of how taking it up clarifies larger realms of thought and politics.

The danger is that without meaningful framing, the urban aspect can be a sloganeering substitute for confronting larger social issues of inequality, health, and racism. High-rise public housing filled a need for sure, but it was hardly a panacea; the switch to low-rise is equally misguided as general solution. We need intellectual tactics to prevent our beloved "urban" from being misapplied.

For me, a good point of entry is to ask, in effect, "how did that get there and that way or through what process did it cease to be." The con crete of the city, its shape and form, can be our entry point for the recursive loop between the social, the artifactual, and the natural. In short, the city, in this sense, can be method. It is a way into culture, political economy and comparative analyses.

Molotch, p. 5

THE LAST NOTE

While the Summer 2019 edition represented my last edition as editor, I've been working with the CUSS Publication Committee in the section's transition to a new editorial team. Steven Schmidt and Kyle Galindez stayed on as well to complete this edition. The new editorial team will debut with the Summer 2020 edition.

-William Holt

Interviews: 2019 ASA CUSS Award Recipients

2019 Park Book Award Recipients

Interviewers
Kyle Galindez
University of California, Santa Cruz
Steven Schmidt
University of California, Irvine

Marcus Anthony Hunter and Zandria F. Robinson. 2018. *Chocolate Cities: The Black Map of American Life*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

- What motivated you to study this research topic?

Chocolate Cities was first motivated by our ongoing desire to decenter Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles as dominant archetypes in urban research. Each of our first monographs focused on cities outside of these paradigms, Philadelphia and Memphis, and we wanted to draw on more cities, more places, to expand our understanding of urban life generally and Black urban life in the U.S. in particular. Our research was also motivated by what we saw as an absence in a literature that has a great deal of influence on how we think and make policy about life in U.S. cities—urban sociology. That absence was epistemological in nature, and relatedly, about the strictness of disciplinary boundaries. In short, Black American worldviews had not generally been central to scholarship about Black people in U.S. cities. We aimed to address this problem by bringing together a range of already existing narratives and theorizations of Black people and cities and putting them together in this one volume alongside original research.

- What surprises did you find as you conducted your fieldwork/study?

We are trained to look for divergent cases, the cases that disprove, the cases that highlight and underscore nuance. We expected, therefore, to find cases where the divergence was so great that our unifying premise would not hold. Yet, what was continually surprising about this work was the similarities in Black people's senses of place and geographies in the U.S., across place, place type, class, nationality, and gender, as well as across art forms. There is a tension there between the importance of place distinctions as producers of different outcomes—we both come from a "place matters" tradition—and the similarities across place that yielded a largely shared mapping of Black communities.

-How do you plan to build on this work in the future?

Chocolate Cities is focused on the U.S. and the Black American experience. But to understand how the Chocolate Map functions beyond this context, we extend our research to include cities outside of the U.S., including in the Caribbean and South America, western Europe, and in western and southern Africa. We are interested in how these cognitive maps function in places with different demographics and histories and what the emerging differences and convergences can tell us about Black people's experiences in and understandings of space and place globally.

Esther Sullivan. 2018. *Manufactured Insecurity: Mobile Home Parks and Americans' Tenuous Right to Place*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

-What motivated you to study this research topic?

My interest in manufactured housing (also called mobile homes or trailers) began when I literally stumbled upon the skeleton of a mobile home park where hundreds of homes had been removed and hundreds of households evicted. The mobile home park was located on the outskirts of the city where I lived, and I came across it while in the field for another research project. Looking out at that property was my first time encountering what I would later come to know as the telltale footprint of a mobile home park mass eviction. Concrete foundations lined streets where mobile homes had been. In an abandoned community center, I found residents' pinned-up ads to sell their homes, their handwritten solicitations for information on the park's closure and help relocating or disposing of their homes.

Despite my primary research interest in low-income housing, I was, until that point, unaware that mobile homes provide the largest unsubsidized source of affordable housing in the U.S. I never knew that 18 million Americans were living in mobile homes or that a portion of these residents place their homes inside mobile home parks where they rent the land under them and can be evicted with as little as 30 days notice. I learned from housing advocates that these mass evictions occurred frequently, but there was no academic research on the factors that contributed to park closures and no data on the outcomes for individuals or communities. I wondered: Where did these residents go? How did they accomplish these moves? What were the costs and consequences? But I also wanted to understand how we as a nation got to a place where one of our largest sources of affordable housing is also one of our most insecure. Discovering the skeleton of that community sparked my interest in the questions that make up the book. Over the next eight years I conducted geospatial analysis to understand patterns of mobile home park closures. I conducted historical analysis to understand the unique place of the mobile home in U.S. culture. I conducted qualitative interviews with landlords and stakeholders within the mobile home industry, with city council members who

make decisions that result in park closures, and with state agency representatives who regulate parks. Finally, I moved into closing mobile home parks in the two states with the largest mobile home populations (Florida and Texas). I lived in these parks over two consecutive years and was evicted alongside my neighbors, following them in to new parks, into precarious housing arrangements, and even into homelessness. The book draws on this mixed-method research to document the experiences of evicted mobile home park residents and to understand what mobile home parks have to tell us about the current state of housing insecurity in the U.S.

-What surprises did you find as you conducted your fieldwork/study?

Over these two years of living in parks before evictions took place and following residents after they were removed from their communities, I found that the physical uprooting that takes place during eviction is only a final symptom of a broader experience of uncertainty that is present long before an eviction takes place. I call this experience the specter of displacement, and I found that long before a city council rezones a park or a landlord decides to shut it down, the threat of eviction is present in mobile home parks because it is inscribed into the land where residents place their homes. Even more surprising was how this shaped residents sense of place long after they'd been removed from their communities. In the words of one Texas resident, Lupe, the eviction process instilled a sense that stayed with her, as sense that as a mobile home resident, "we're not for sure wherever we are."

-How do you plan to build on this work in the future?

Many of the findings from Manufactured Insecurity relate to how state and local laws determine where mobile home parks can be located and how that ultimately shapes housing insecurity for households living in parks. A natural extension of this work is examining how this plays out during and after disasters. Mobile home parks are frequently affected by disasters, but their vulnerability has not been comprehensively studied. Right now I am working on a National Science Foundation-funded study with planning faculty at the University of Colorado Denver and Texas A&M to track the recovery of hurricane-impacted parks over time and identify the reasons for differential damage and recovery across parks in Houston after Hurricane Harvey and in Florida after Hurricanes Michael and Irma.

Molotch, from p. 3

One critical obsolescence of our prior para digms is the collective effect of climate change. In grappling with this wicked problem, we need to think about how our urbanism as a way of life is a destroyer. We need to learn the ways particular settlement configuration exacerbate earth impact. We need to figure out how to repudiate the value-free development doctrines, world-wide, that lead to catastrophe. Going green needs some red – with approaches that are positive, practical, and that leverage potential for human solidarity. The downside of recycling is its ineffectiveness; the upside is its display of mass participation for a common cause. How can that "instinct" be bottled but made significant rather than trivial.

What advice would you give to new researchers?

Coming into sociology at a time of plentiful jobs, my own pleasurable enthusiasm was likely historically exceptional. That said, I can declare that I really did follow my fascinations and try to make myself useful. I did see some less fortunate colleagues stuck in the rut of strategizing; it made their work less interesting for themselves and probably didn't help their careers much either. What to do? Curiosity is really all we have that has at least the potential to pay off both on and off the job. It is a reason to get up in the morning.

Facilities face a lot of challenges today. What advice would you give to residents and activists who are concerned about issues in their neighborhoods?

It is discouraging to witness how much urban activism goes not to progressive agendas but to those based in fear of those agendas. Ironically, change is made horrible because there's such a weak safety net, even for the middle-class. Some of the resulting anxiety clutters public discourse with resentment against newcomers and hostility toward those driven, like the homeless and the ill, to repugnant life strategies. We all know that miseries at the level of appearances -- even public elimination at the extreme -- come from the deeper realms. Urbanists have a direct line to those appearances as well as means to know their source. We have the job, as a consistent matter, to convincingly explain these extreme local troubles as traceable to policies and politics that do people in.

Interviews: 2019 ASA CUSS Award Recipients

2019 Addams Article Award Recipient

-Papachristos, Andrew and Sara Bastomski. 2018. "Connected in Crime: The Enduring Effect of Neighborhood Networks on the Spatial Patterning of Violence." ***American Journal of Sociology*** **124:517-568.**

-What motivated you to study this particular research topic?

We were intrigued by the way in which social scientists think about—and measure—how crime and violence "move" across space. There is a long and rich history in urban sociology of examining the association between higher crime and various features of neighborhoods, including structural measures (e.g. neighborhood disadvantage) and social processes (e.g. collective efficacy); and studies have shown that higher crime rates not only concentrate in particular areas of cities, but also diffuse - or spread- from one place to the next.

Most statistical models, however, have struggled to explain how micro-level interactions relate to aggregate-level phenomena. Spatial regression models, for instance, tend to measure how aggregate rates, not people, move and are based on statistical assumptions that fail to incorporate how social networks might transcend traditional spatial movement patterns. Our study aimed to examine how the real movement of people across time and space might link geographic neighborhoods and, in so doing document structural pathways that spread social behaviors.

We contend that residents of different neighborhoods who co-offend together provide pathways by which criminal behavior spreads. We used over 2 million arrest records from the Chicago Police Department, to understand how co-offending is spatially patterned, and how co-offending forms a network that contributes to variation in violent crime rates across the city. In doing so, we were able to link individual-level actions (i.e. arrest events) to macro-trends. This means that we no longer have to imagine what human behavior is contributing to the concentration and diffusion of crime – we can actually measure and map it.

-What theoretical debates interest you the most, and how do you see your research contributing to them?

We were most interested in expanding the way the neighborhood effects literature conceptualizes and measures mechanisms and structures. More specifically, we see our work as advancing recent conceptualization of "neighborhood networks" that are trying to understand how neighborhoods themselves have particular patterns of interconnections and how these patterns impact a variety of outcomes. Our focus on co-offending theoretically combines a long tradition of criminological research on the group nature of delinquency with more recent research on network dynamics of crime and violence. Empirically, we contribute to this burgeoning research by exploring one possible way to consistently measure the ways neighborhoods are "connected in crime" and how this impacts the ways we measure the stability and diffusion of violence.

-What surprises occurred as you conducted your study?

While we went into this study anticipating that neighborhood co-offending networks would display some stability from year to year in Chicago, the level of stability we observed was remarkable. We looked at six years of data and, in short, neighborhoods tend to be robustly connected to each other by individuals who engage in criminal activity together over time, even though it is not the same individuals committing crime year-by-year. Using exponential random graph models, we were able to show that neighborhood structural conditions and social processes can either promote or discourage inter-neighborhood co-offending links, which in turn promote higher crime.

We were also surprised that inter-neighborhood co-offending reaches into neighborhoods that have average or even low levels of crime, and that these connections do not fade even over a six-year period. Some of these neighborhood networks defy traditional spatial assumptions and yet might be quite important to understand the relationships places have with each other. The implication here again is that across the city, inter-neighborhood co-offending links are robust and persistent.

-What are some future directions for this project and line of research?

There are a number of future directions for this line of work. It would be great to conduct similar studies in other major US cities, to understand how co-offending patterns differ based on other city or neighborhood level factors such as transportation, housing, commuting patterns, schooling, etc. Additionally, because our study investigated homicide rates as an outcome, future work could examine the relationship between inter-neighborhood co-offending and other types of neighborhood level outcomes and social processes. Finally, future work could determine how best to dismantle inter-neighborhood co-offending networks, perhaps by simulating how the network evolves as targeted interventions weaken pathways between particular neighborhoods.

2019 CUSS Student Paper Award Recipient

-Zachary Hyde, University of British Columbia. 2018. "Giving Back to Get Ahead: Altruism as a Developer Strategy of Accumulation Through Affordable Housing Policy in Toronto and Vancouver," *Geoforum* (online ahead of print)

-What were the main findings of your paper?

My paper "Giving Back to Get Ahead" focuses on the popular urban policy of density bonusing, where private development companies provide affordable housing and other social services in exchange for extra density. The main finding of the paper is that density bonusing forms a paradox, whereby "giving back" social services simultaneously increases developer profits. Through contributing services developers enhance their symbolic capital via gift-giving, which can be traded in for economic advantages in future dealings with local governments.

What motivated you to study this particular research topic?

I originally became interested in studying developers through my research on gentrification. I had been looking at social enterprise businesses, which mix profit-making with social service objectives, in the context of low-income neighborhoods. I began to notice that developers were making similar arguments about "socially conscious" mixed-income development, and this was tied to their increasing involvement in affordable housing provision. I wanted to know how these policies of density-for-social benefits were being implemented and understood by different actors in the field of urban development.

I carried out a study focusing on one particular developer that was becoming well-known for negotiating rezoning for social benefits throughout Canada. I studied this developer operating in two cities, Toronto and Vancouver, both with a similar approach to densification, but with different political structures. Based on this approach, these findings can speak to other cases, like New York City, where density bonusing has become central to Mayor De Blasio's Housing New York plan since 2014. The Lincoln Institute for Land Policy recently launched a large-scale study of "land-value capture," which included density bonusing, suggesting that more and more local governments are turning to this policy framework.

-What theoretical debates interest you the most, and how do you see your research contributing to them?

My main interest is in the processes through which neoliberalism achieves legitimacy. In my dissertation I contribute to a number of debates related to this overarching topic, for example, by illustrating how non-market exchange, such as reciprocity, obfuscates the privatization of the welfare state. I also unpack the contradictions of progressive, yet growth-oriented, urban politics, or progressive growth machines.

More broadly, I am also interested in combining the concepts and ideas of economic sociology and urban sociology. While there has been some great work in this direction by scholars such as Frederick Wherry, Deborah Becher and Josh Pacewitz, there is still a lot of room for productive interface between the two fields. For example, in my paper I draw on Jens Beckert's recent framework of imagined futures, which highlights the way capitalism relies on fictional expectations about the future, to explain how developers justify increases in density. Finally, I've been working on developing a new framework for economic sociology based on the work of Karl Polanyi.

What surprises occurred as you conducted your fieldwork?

A surprising finding during my research in Toronto was the developer's reliance on community outreach workers, many of whom were young geography and urban planning graduate students from local universities. These part-time employees were often well-versed in critical urban theory and felt conflicted about their position working for a development firm. However, they also played an important role in providing developers with legitimacy, as they were able to effectively reframe community opposition to new developments as self-interested actions by homeowners. This led me to think about the pathways through which urban knowledge, generated in the academy, makes its way into on-the-ground tensions around development.

-What are some future directions for this project?

My latest research project extends my interest in housing and the politics of density by focusing on the resurgence of private rental housing in North American cities, and how this contributes to urban inequality. My plan is to focus on four large cities across Canada and the US, which are sites of two intersecting patterns: state-led incentives for the development of rental housing in the face of housing crises, and the rising acquisition of existing and newly-built rentals by real estate holding corporations and pension funds. This will continue my interest in the symbolic systems of housing by exploring how long-standing associations between rentals and affordability are being used to justify profit-oriented development by the state and the private sector.

Lynd Award, *from page 1*

"Where does one go when obsessed with these types of questions? You guessed it. Graduate school. "

-Anne Shlay

me. Dostoyevsky, in my mind, wrote about human authenticity– a form of truth telling about people's motivations, often dark ones that could not be seen on the surface.

Wasiolek's final lecture on Dostoyevsky led me to become a social scientist. He offered up a quote by Dostoyevsky that "…if someone proved to me that God is outside truth, and that in reality the truth was outside God, I should prefer to remain with God rather than the truth."

You may think me naïve but I was utterly shaken. My sovereign of truth chose a religious deity over reality? That he would rather wallow in religious ideology than face the reality of which he was totally aware. Was I simply taken along for the ride with the idea that Dostoyevsky was a truth bearing idol? To this day, almost 50 years later I still feel the jolt of disappointment.

Beyond Dostoyevsky

I felt betrayed. I talked to my friends who gave me nicknames like Moon Girl because they thought I was "spacy," in the language of the day. They brought me with them to parties and told me simply to talk and people gathered around to hear me speak about what is truth. I thought that talking to someone who knew sociology of religion might be able to help and I found a professor, Whitney Pope, who agreed to study with me. The topic, "why do people believe." He led me to tomes about religion starting with Durkheim and Weber. I found out that religion had some purpose. Symbols and rituals were central to keeping society together. And God maintained its message and relevancy by its organization of bureaucracies that supported the faithful. God might be part of truth but this was fundamentally irrelevant. Social order depended on God, ritual and bureaucracy. My quest for the meaning of God and religion had gotten me nowhere. And I was only 21!

I don't remember how I got into the Frankfurt School of Social Research and then Antonio Gramsci. There was an additional layer to the preservation of social order and I learned that it had purpose – the preservation of capitalism. Gramsci called this ideological domination using the concept of political hegemony. And this domination was so strong that it was virtually impossible to tell truth from fiction. Right back where I started. I had only just begun -again.

Where does one go when obsessed with these types of questions? You guessed it. Graduate school.

The Calling of Social Research

I went to graduate school with the expressed purpose of learning how to do research that would expose the social order as lies. But I did not want to shout about lies like my Bolshevik poets. I wanted to prove that lies were untrue using research and methods. I wanted to be a bearer of truth that could not be disputed. In my brain, truth would overthrow oppression, sort of like turning Dostoyevsky on his head.

The world needed facts to show them (whoever they were) the lies upon which social order was based. To disprove lies required proving truth. And truth in social research came from methods – the scientific kind.

The idea that method led to truth was part of the underpinnings of academic sociology in those days, the early 1970s. The prevailing wisdom was positivism, the idea that truth emerged from research with verifiable methods. The positivists, largely quantitative researchers, were viewed as conservative maintainers of the status quo. With the belief that empirically verifiable methods were neither right nor left, I thought that I could be to be part of a revolution that used positivism to overthrow capitalism, oppression, whatever. I embraced positivism and threw myself into learning qualitative and quantitative techniques. People thought I would become a theorist given my proclivities but I said no. And then I found Peter Rossi.

Pete was the methodologist of methodologists in the positivist vein, suggesting that he was one of those arch enemies preserving the status quo. But his politics became clear to me the day after I was arrested at a demonstration. He called

me into his office. I thought my research assistantship was doomed. Instead he said that he had read the newspapers, saw I was arrested and wanted to know if I needed any money. Conservative? No way.

I came to realize that being a so-called positivist did not mean divorcing politics from research. Instead methods per se was neutral. The questions were what counted and methods helped provide the evidence needed for political persuasion. I thought research could help provide the requisite evidence to support social change. I believed that applying the best methods devoid of obvious flaws could produce defensible research that could be central to social change. And to wage what I called a war, I became a Rossi student and tied myself to the best and most creative methodologist in the world. Attaching myself to Pete Rossi and his research comrade, Jim Wright, remain the best decision I ever made in my life.

Shaping a Research Career as a Radical Positivist

I threw myself into empiricism. I wrote an MA thesis on tenant organizing based on primary data collection qualitative field work. My dissertation on the exclusionary effects of zoning regulations, also primary data collection, used multivariate statistical models. I took books on econometrics to bed.

Credibility, I thought, required standing in the field so I published. I wanted to be believed and this is how I thought I would get that. How could someone dismiss a person with seemingly impeccable methods and a laundry list of publications to their name?

I did not believe in discipline per se; I believed in method. I took my first job in an economics department. I took jobs doing applied policy research in and outside of universities. I did research on what I thought were important topics, often in collaboration with groups in the community. I continued to publish. I ignored tenure track jobs. I was interesting, or so I thought.

It was only after I became a single mother with a 14-month-old daughter that I caved to wanting economic security. Twelve years after finishing my Ph.D. I took a tenure track position. I got tenure the next year and became a full professor the following year. Getting promoted had never been a serious goal despite my productivity but I was thrilled to have some economic security for my daughter and me.

I could discuss my misplaced arrogance and the price I paid along the way. I rarely thought about sexism, a near fatal flaw to be sure. But I had energy. I believed I was on the right side. I was methodologically sophisticated and productive. And I met a ton of wonderful people along the way. Many of them remain my closest friends. Buoyed by the fundamental belief that the left could topple oppression with social science, who needed God?

The Work

Sociologists must make their own judgement of whether they are doing good. I believe that this is central question that should be asked early and often. I finish this essay by talking about some of my research projects. As my graduate students and collaborators will attest, I tried to do good, to do good research and be a voice against oppression, not rhetorically but as one proving truth. My goal inevitably came down to supporting organizing and advocacy.

Tenant Organizing

Tenant organizing and rent control were strategies in the 1970 for renters to gain control of their housing, a concept I rarely hear now. Studying a tenant union in the process of organizing during a massive rent control campaign, I learned the difficulty of using organization to wield power when organizational members were transient. Most importantly, I came to understand that tenants saw themselves as unworthy of power and control because of the dominant belief that homeownership and homeowners reigned supreme. Power could not be won without changing the dominant ideology that renters were solely would-be homeowners or deadbeats that failed to become homeowners.

Land Use Regulations

Both sociologists and economists viewed urban spatial patterns as natural and inevitable. Land use regulations, however, stipulated how land could be developed. Therefore, neighborhood wealth and poverty, housing and land use were not the stuff of forever but were deliberately shaped by local policies. And if policy shaped housing and neighborhoods as segregated homogeneous spatial areas, policy could be used to mix land use and create housing opportunities for everybody. I studied zoning in the Chicago metropolitan area to show how these regulations had major and independent effects on neighborhood land use and income levels. Neighborhood segregation and homogeneity were political creations not because of natural economic or social laws. Change could and should happen.

Housing and Neighborhood Ideology

But what was holding back change in the spatial organization of metropolitan areas? Why were land use regulations so popular and effective? What were the ideas behind zoning for homogeneity? I decided to look at what I called a housing and neighborhood ideology shaped dominant belief structures guiding housing choices and neighborhood homogeneity. Market forces be

Lynd Award, p. 10

Lynd Award, *from page 9*

damned.

Using what is called the factorial survey approach, I empirically measured the values that people place on housing type, tenure (ownership versus rental), racial and income composition, access to public transportation and more. I found that neighborhood housing tenure (owners or renters) did not matter at all. But characteristics like racial composition were a big factor. Race was more important than housing in neighborhood desirability? Travel time to work and access to public transportation was important to women, not men. The conventional land use of suburbs was desired by men, not women. Urban structure was both racist and sexist.

Fighting the 1992 Chicago World's Fair

One of the most inspiring perspectives coming out of urban sociology (by Harvey Molotch and John Logan) was the concept of a growth machine that worked behind the scenes to orchestrate growth and development for the benefit of economic elites. In the early 1980s, Chicago embarked on a mission to attract the designation for a world's fair in 1992. This effort, pushed by the 1992 Committee, was to capture the designation for this six- month event (like the Olympics). These designations unleash public and private spending on targeted development. What remains, these urban "residuals," are the stuff of big event planning and a boondoggle for business interests.

Of course, the organizing of these events is typically undemocratic. This was the essence of how the growth machine worked. With Robert Giloth, we sought to uncover exactly how undemocratic it was. Through corporate directorship and social membership data, we were able to demonstrate a set of business interests (interlocking directorates) that pushed the 1992 Fair. We worked directly with local organizers while feeding our work to local publications as well as talking to the press. Nonetheless, we anticipated that the fair was a done deal and we would, in the end, have documented how democracy did not work. But surprise, Harold Washington was elected mayor of Chicago. He looked at this planned event and without skipping a beat, called it off. This was a short-term successful community organizing effort backed by our research.

Redlining and Neighborhood Disinvestment

Leaving the university for a stint, I took a research job at an advocacy organization that worked on banking issues. In the early 1980s, the government had released computerized HMDA data, that is data coming out of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. It showed the number and dollar volume of residential loans at the census tract level. I was hired to statistically analyze these data to see whether areas were being redlining – banks not making loans in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and by neighborhoods of varying racial composition.

This was tricky stuff and very complicated. I developed a set of statistical models that showed that neighborhood disinvestment and redlining could be demonstrated on a metropolitan wide basis.

These finding did not go without challenge and I was thrust into what were called the HMDA wars, a multi-year period of arguing about methods and findings with regulators, economists and lawyers. It was not for the faint of heart. Doing the research was easy. Fighting the methodological battles was difficult and occurred in public. A lot was at stake on all sides.

To cut down on the massive numbers of calls I received about how to replicate my methods, I wrote an academic article called "Proving Disinvestment." For years it was the most popular piece I ever wrote, particularly from people involved in the community reinvestment right.

The most fun was using research to support what are called CRA challenges. Under a regulation called the Community Reinvestment Act, lenders could be denied permission to merge with or acquire another institution or from even opening a branch if it could be demonstrated that the lender was not making loans in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. A challenge could slow down expensive business transactions and for lenders, time is money. There were those who called these challenges holding banks hostage and I suppose we were. To be honest, that was the entire point which was to give community groups leverage. And it got a lot of attention.

What was negotiated, however, in the process were huge sums of money (millions of dollars) in CRA agreements that required lenders to make loans in neighborhoods that they had previously abandoned. I was the lead researcher behind many of these challenges and was often kept in the background to avoid creating the perception of bias in the research. Community Organizing I developed a wonderful partnership with a community coalition called the Eastern Philadelphia Organizing Project known as EPOP. Its head, Steve Honeyman, understood that fact-based research (call it positivism) could be a critical tool for organizing and winning. The partnership was called Research for Democracy. Together we raised substantial funds to conduct research that supported EPOP organizing. In this partnership, I did not select the research topics. They came out of the actual

struggles that engaged EPOP. Community organizing tied to quality defensible empirical research would provide leverage in power situations that affected low income neighborhoods in Philadelphia.

Sometimes it did. The most important project we did was on neighborhood housing abandonment. In Philly, more than 40,000 structures and lots were abandoned. The mayor came up with a plan that would benefit developers, not neighborhood residents. We conducted research that demonstrated what happened to the many neighborhoods with even small amounts of abandonment, not the large areas the mayor chose to target. I even taught regression analysis to community organizers who became conversant in talking about B coefficients, the measured effect in the specified equations.

Childcare Quality

Largely at the behest of policy makers and the foundation community, I teamed up with two developmental psychologists, Marsha Weinraub and Lyz Jaeger, to work on early child care. My skills in evaluation research, a legacy of working with Peter Rossi, became central to informing funders about the impact of child care intervention programs. Many questions were central, all of which remain today. How to improve the quality of care when the profession is so poorly paid with excessive staff turnover. How to promote access to child care subsidies particularly for very poor women who by law or necessity are required to enter the unskilled, low wage labor force. How to understand how women, largely low-income women, selected child care arrangements and what could be done to have them make choices that would provide better outcomes for their children. What we found and recommended were small potatoes compared to the size of the problem including women's lower wages automatically creating a ceiling on child care wages. Gender inequality ripples and ripples and ripples.

Jerusalem Spatial Politics

I became interested in Jerusalem after visiting with my synagogue. I learned on this trip that Jerusalem was a city of multi-ethnic and racial differences with Jews coming from all over the world. But what was most interesting for me at the time was Jerusalem housing. All the housing in Jerusalem was high density apartments (at least for Jews). Wow. I saw new possibilities for reshaping American land use. I wrote a Fulbright application and got the fellowship and an appointment at The Hebrew University.

My interests changed when I got to Jerusalem. I inadvertently learned that I was living on occupied territory near the university, on an actual settlement surrounded by other Jewish settlements. I was horrified for two reasons: one that Jerusalem successfully disguised occupied land and two, that I had no clue that I was an occupier. Housing density then took low priority. I wanted to learn how Israel succeeded in making political boundaries invisible.

The Shifting Green Line Project, named after the 1948 boundary that indicated the borders of Israel, was born in collaboration with then Hebrew University graduate student now professor, Gillad Rosen. We traveled across Jerusalem and the West Bank, interviewed a multitude of people and more. I lived in Jerusalem on and off every chance I had.

What transpired over almost a decade were articles and a book on the spatial politics of Jerusalem. I developed a course on Jerusalem. My goal, perhaps naïve, was to educate people, particularly Americans, on how the Jerusalem metropolitan area was created both illegally but openly. What appeared to many as simply Jerusalem suburbanization was a method of conquest, domination and imperialism. The West Bank of today was even larger before Israel created its "new neighborhoods" and illegally annexed them to Israel and Jerusalem. The shifting green line was a metaphor for how Israel used its power to reshape perceptions of what is Jerusalem and Israel. I thought that knowledge of

Lynd Award, p. 12

"What we found and recommended were small potatoes compared to the size of the problem including women's lower wages automatically creating a ceiling on child care wages. Gender inequality ripples and ripples and ripples."

-Anne Shlay

American Sociological Association Community & Urban Sociology Section

William Grady Holt
CUSS Newsletter Editor
Coordinator
Urban Environmental Studies Program
Birmingham-Southern College
900 Arkadelphia Road
Birmingham, AL 35254

Phone: 205-226-4834
Fax: 205-226-4847
E-mail: wholt@bsc.edu

We're on the web:
The Community Web

http://www.commurb.org

Lynd Award, *from page 11*

this would help empower policy makers and the like to correct for these obvious spatial inequities.

Giving Back

I attended my first ASA meeting in 1979. Previewing the room ahead of time, a large ballroom with chandeliers, I was nervous enough to prefer death over giving my paper. I lived to give many more ASA presentations.

ASA meetings were particularly important to me because during most of my career, I did not work in sociology departments. I needed to be reminded spiritually and intellectually where I came from.

My ASA devotion took off when I got divorced. My daughter was just a baby and I thought that my conference going was over. Though I joked about putting her in a locker at the airport, I had no idea how to be a single parent professional. How unbelievable I discovered that the ASA in 1990 had on-site child care. Emma went to many ASA meeting to the point where when absent, people asked where she was.

I joined the Community and Urban Sociology Section and quickly became enamored with its organizational development. I remember when taking over as chair of the section, someone asked me how I "got" to be chair. I explained that I started in the mail room and that I probably had headed or been on almost every committee. I helped champion City and Community with lots of others and even got the section to vote themselves a $3 dues increase when it seemed like our finances were doomed. I thank the CUSS for this award and I am forever grateful for the love and comradery.

Summing Up

This four-decade career of research, policy and politics was one of speaking a bit of truth to power. Did I remain true to my cause of using research to break down prevailing ideologies? I could have done better. Would Dostoyevsky have chosen my truth over God? Probably not. I am today much less certain about research as a vehicle for truth constructing. I could talk about the pressures of academic publishing, the uselessness of the research dissemination process, the intractability of capitalism and of course, the distracting academic debates that go nowhere. Gramsci called academics "traditional intellectuals" whose main function is to support the superstructure from which ideological domination successfully emerges. I wanted to be an "organic intellectual," a bearer of revolutionary authenticity while having the accreditation and security of my traditional intellectual status.

Truth is often buried beneath the weight of rhetoric. And what is the point of truth if it goes nowhere? Of course, the struggle is to take that truth where it needs to go.